

2018

## English or Englishes? Outer and Expanding Circle Teachers' Awareness of and Attitudes towards their Own Variants of English in ESL/EFL Teaching Contexts

Abbas Monfared

*Allameh Tabataba'i University, abbasmonfared85@gmail.com*

Mohammad Khatib

*Allameh Tabataba'i University, mkhatib27@yahoo.com*

---

### Recommended Citation

Monfared, A., & Khatib, M. (2018). English or Englishes? Outer and Expanding Circle Teachers' Awareness of and Attitudes towards their Own Variants of English in ESL/EFL Teaching Contexts. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(2).  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n2.4>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.  
<http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol43/iss2/4>

## English or Englishes? Outer and Expanding Circle Teachers' Awareness of and Attitudes towards their Own Variants of English in ESL/EFL Teaching Contexts

Abbas Monfared, Allameh Tabataba'i  
Mohammad Khatib  
Allameh Tabataba'i  
University, Iran

*Abstract: One of the challenging issues that has gained much attention, and has in fact sparked much debate, within the emergence and acquisition of World Englishes, is the Native- Non-native accent, especially its relationship with teachers' and learners' identity and selection of an appropriate pedagogic model. This paper investigates the attitudes of 260 English teachers from India and Iran as members of Outer and Expanding Circles, respectively. Using a questionnaire, this study measures cognitive, affective and behavioral attitudes of teachers towards their own English accents in two circles which include the most users of English in the globalized world. The results show that teachers in the Expanding Circle (Kachru, 1992), compared to those in the Outer Circle, had an exonormative orientation, favoring native-speaker and mostly American English pronunciation. Indian teachers were in favor of endonormativity, highly valued their local forms of English while they were in favor of British English. Teachers' preferences will be discussed with consideration of the historical and political backgrounds of the two countries which might have influenced the construction of teachers' identity. The results of this study suggest that, together with encouraging and valuing different varieties of English, it is important to acknowledge and promote ways to raise awareness of teachers and learners towards global spread of English.*

### Introduction

With the rapid growth of English as an international language (EIL) much interest has been stated in the status of native speaker (NS) norm, especially in the realm of English Language Teaching (ELT) which has created serious challenges to the traditional conceptualization of English language teaching. The global spread of English can have many different political, historical, economic and scientific reasons but one distinguished implication of it is the emergence of multiple varieties of English which has given new names to English such as 'International English' (e.g., McKay, 2012), 'English as a lingua franca' (ELF), often used interchangeably with EIL (e.g., Jenkins, 2000; Seidlhofer, 2011) and 'World Englishes' (WE) (e.g., Jenkins, 2003; Kachru & Nelson, 2006; Kirkpatrick, 2007, 2011). Kachru's

description (1989) of the use of English in the world and a recent estimate that the number of English language users are close to 2 billion users in the world (Schneider, 2011) imply the fact that varieties of English and new educational methodologies will be predictable in the near future. In this regard, ELT should mainly concentrate on the global aspect of English in order to promote English as an international language.

One of the most challenging issues in the realm of globalization is the matter of pronunciation in the ELT classroom. Traditionally, NS pronunciation such as Received Pronunciation (RP) and General American (GA) has been regarded as the main goal for second-language (L2) learners in most ELT contexts. As McKay (2012, p.10) mentions ‘traditionally L2 pedagogy and research have been dominated by the assumption that the goal of bilingual users of English is to achieve native-like competence in English. To cope with nativism in ELT contexts, two pedagogical models, namely ELF and nativised model, have been proposed. Lingua Franca model (ELF) chiefly focuses on cross-cultural communication and would accommodate cultural conventions and pragmatic norms that differ from Anglo-American norms. According to Kirkpatrick (2007), the endonormative model which supports non-native teachers is the one where ‘a localised version of the language’ has become socially acceptable. (p. 189).

There has been an increasing number of studies supporting the acceptance of other varieties of English (e.g. Indian English) alongside AmE and BrE (Jenkins, 2007, 2012, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2010, 2015; Matsuda, 2017; McKay & Brown, 2016). However, there are relatively few published studies on teachers’ attitudes towards the pronunciation of their English variants in Outer and Expanding Circle communities. In addition, the majority of these earlier studies focused on pronunciation using matched guise technique or the verbal guise technique (VGT) which investigate attitude related to accent (Bayard et al., 2001; Dailey et al., 2005; Delamere, 1996; Tokumoto and Shibata, 2011; Zhang, 2013). There has been a dearth of published research on English teachers’ attitudes, and, in particular, into the cognitive, affective and behavioral elements of these attitudes (Bayyurt and Sifakis, 2015; Sifakis, 2009; Sifakis & Sougari, 2005; Timmis, 2002).

This paper focuses mainly on the cognitive, affective and behavioral attitudes of Indian and Iranian teachers across two main circles of world Englishes to see how the participants defined, perceived and reacted to their own English accents and makes recommendations for better synchronization of teachers’ pedagogical objectives with the needs of learners in ESL and EFL contexts.

## **Review of Literature**

### **Core of Attitude: Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Elements**

Although people hold different attitudes toward many different features of speech (e.g., speech rate or speech style), one of the most significant attributes is accent. Investigations have shown that listeners make judgments regarding the personal and social characteristics of speakers based simply on the way they sound. Attitude can be defined ‘as a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor’ (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993, p. 15). Our attitudes towards varieties of language can permeate our daily lives. As Garret (2010) mentions ‘our competence, intelligence, friendliness, trustworthiness, social status, group memberships, and so on, are often judged from the way we communicate’.

The concept of attitude has been discussed from different aspects in a number of studies. According to Oppenheim (1982) and Garret (2010), attitudes can be talked about in terms of

three main components; cognitive, affective and behavioral. The Cognitive component deals perceptions and knowledge people have about the attitude object under evaluation (in this study, Iranian and Indian teachers' attitude about the pronunciation of their English variants). The affective component of attitude is the feelings, moods, emotions and sympathetic nervous-system activity (Eagly & Chaiken, 1998, p. 272) that people experience in relation to the attitude object and lately associate with it. This component as a barometer of favorability or unfavorability (Garret, 2010) can show the extent to which teachers approve or disapprove of the attitude object. Thirdly, the behavioral component is the actual behavior or behavior intention towards the attitude object. In terms of language, if we consider a teacher's attitude towards English as a foreign or second language, we could talk about a cognitive component (I believe that learning English will give me a deeper understanding of English culture), an affective component (I am happy with my English accent), and behavioral component (I would like to sound like a native speaker of English).

### **Attitudes and Accents**

Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum (1960) developed the study of language attitudes for the first time. Two groups of respondents in Montreal, Canada, one English-speaking and the other Canadian French-speaking were presented with recordings in both English and French languages and were asked to rate each speaker according to physical traits, as well as mental and emotional attributes. Listeners from both groups were actually evaluating the same speaker in different guises and were not aware of this issue. This 'matched guise technique' revealed underlying prejudices towards English and French languages and their speakers in Canada.

Most studies focusing on the attitudes of L1 English speakers towards varieties of English speech have revealed that standard accents (also named 'social status' accents) aim to be evaluated more prestigious compared to 'non-standard' accents (also named 'social attractiveness' or 'solidarity' accents) (Bradac & Wisegarver, 1984; Cheyne 1970; Coupland and Bishop 2007; Johnson & Buttny, 1982; Luhman, 1990; Tucker & Lambert, 1969). As Milroy (2007, p. 133) mentions 'language attitudes are dominated by powerful ideological positions that are largely based on the supposed existence of this standard form, and these, taken together can be said to constitute the standard language ideology or 'ideology of the standard language'. For example, Morrish (1999) reported how, in the 1970s, one boy at his school was excluded from a member of the TV 'Top of the Form' school team because his Bristolian English was considered as 'inappropriate for broadcasting'. In another study, Stewart, Ryan and Giles (1985) elicited prejudiced attitudes towards RP and standard American English. In their study, attitude rating scales involved both social status traits (e.g., intelligent, successful) and solidarity (or social attractiveness) traits (e.g., friendly, sincere). The findings of the study revealed that RP speakers are judged to have more status compared to American speakers, but, again, with less social attractiveness. Bishop (1979) also reported that white females rated African American colleagues as less accountable and less desirable colleagues when they spoke 'Black' as opposed to 'White' English.

Some investigations have revealed attitudes towards varieties of English among L2 speakers in the L1 context. For example, in Japan (McKenzie, 2008; Suzuki, 2011), in Korea (Ahn, 2014; McDonald & McRae, 2010; Young & Walsh, 2010), in Denmark (Ladegaard &

Sachdev, 2006); in Greece (Sifakis, 2009; Sifakis&Sougari, 2005), in Taiwan (Huang, 2016; Luo, 2016), in Hong Kong (Zhang, 2013), in China (Meilin& Xiaoqiong, 2006), in Norway (Rindal 2010), in Europe (Groom, 2012) and in Iran (Sharifian, 2009, 2010). Overall, these studies have shown tendencies concerning degree of awareness of other varieties of English, preferences towards these varieties, as well as their social and cultural meanings. L2 speakers of English generally are in favor of inner-circle varieties of English speech.

Teachers' practices can exert a lasting influence on learners' perceptions and their preference towards nativism or varieties of English. According to Erkmen (2010), beliefs are associated with general or scientific knowledge that can be implicit, factual or experiential and, thus, affective and evaluative in nature. From this viewpoint, learners' perceptions are more directly shaped by their classroom experience due to the absence of the professional knowledge necessary for shaping and reshaping beliefs. Graves (2000) highlighted the importance of the learning experience by relating teachers' beliefs to their past experience as learners. As Brown and McGannon (2007) emphasize incorrect beliefs teachers hold about foreign language learning (e.g., blind follower of nativism) can influence their teaching, and thereby their learners' beliefs. Suzuki (2011) observed that Japanese student teachers prioritized standard American or British English to local varieties of English in the classroom, even though they were aware of the importance of varieties of English. To inform teachers that English for international communication is as important as American or British English, Suzuki proposed that teacher educators should raise teachers' awareness of varieties of English in curricula. In another study, Sifakis and Sougari (2005) showed that Greek teachers are in favor of native speakers as 'the rightful owners of English. Tsui and Bunton (2000), after studying thousands of electronic messages sent by both Native and Non-native English teachers in Hong Kong, also found that Hong Kong teachers were reflecting a preference for 'exonormative' standards rather than 'endonormative' ones. Exonormative orientation is advocated by the belief that native speaker pronunciations such as Received Pronunciation (RP) and General American (GA) are the 'best', or perhaps even the only 'correct' forms of the language, which, thus, naturally should be offered to (and requested from) students and of course it is pushed by international publishing houses. Hong Kong teachers relied more heavily on external sources of reliable information and they never thought about the possibility of shifting to Hong Kong English as a possible model.

Raising teachers' awareness of varieties of English would be helpful to improve teachers' confidence in their own local English and clear some of the prejudice that might undermine their competence alongside native varieties of English (Ahn, 2017). Two studies by Bayyurt and Sifakis (2015) and Sifakis (2014) show that non- native users of English who have a comprehensive understanding of different varieties of English more successfully lead their affective and behavioural reactions in their own English usage, resulting in their either accepting, rejecting or adapting their own language usage according to the way other varieties of English are used.

Interaction of social, cultural and linguistic features in the teaching of English will be different between teachers and contexts. This investigation brings to light the ways in which English teachers in Outer and Expanding Circles identify with different varieties of English. It also ascertains teachers' pronunciation favorites and goals, which may be applied to reshape EFL teaching context. It has been witnessed that a special attitude towards a particular language may result in the stereotyping of the object attitude, which can be advantageous to one group and/or detrimental to others (Friedrich, 2000). Investigating attitudes towards a language, therefore,

may provide costly information on building better understandings of these issues and may decrease some of the detrimental effects on others.

### **The Historical Background of English in Iran and India**

Iran can be regarded as an 'Expanding Circle' context. The Expanding Circle (Kachru, 1992) includes countries such as France, Iran, South Korea, Russia and Brazil, where English is mainly used as a foreign language. Generally, English in this context is not extensively spoken for communicative purposes but widely taught within the education system. Educators and policy makers in the Expanding Circle context have traditionally preferred AmE or BrE to local Englishes as target models of English education (Kirkpatrick, 2007; McKay, 2002).

The history of English in Iran has undergone a host of extreme ups and downs. Before the Islamic revolution of Iran, strong military and economic attendance of The United States was an impetus for the development of English as the most important foreign language in Iran (Tollefson, 1991, Borjian, 2013). During this period, many Americans came to Iran to teach English and there were many language centers that employed native speakers of English. Under such conditions, then, English was considered to belong to the Americans and the British, and these two varieties of English were thought to be the only ideal forms of English. After the revolution of 1979, the fate of the English language changed in Iran. The post-revolutionary government tried to develop English local materials based on Islamic and Iranian values for state schools and university curricula. The indisputable deficiencies of English learning in public sector English learning led to the growth of a new booming private sector ELT market. (Davari & Aghagolzadeh, 2015). The last decade in particular has witnessed an outstanding increase in the number of Iranians learning English particularly in private schools.

On the other hand, India can be categorized as an 'Outer Circle' context (Kachru, 1985). The Outer Circle includes countries such as India, Nigeria, Singapore and Philippines. In these countries, English has been institutionalized as an additional language. Typically, these countries came under British or American colonial administration before acceding to independence. English in these countries continues to be used for intra- ethnic communication in various social, educational and administrative domains. (Ahn, 2017, p. 4).

British influence in India goes back a long time, at least to the Victorian age. English was brought to India by the British government, employed as a tool in their civilization project, as a medium of their education system and as the backbone of colonial administration (Krishnaswamy, 2006). The English Education Act was a legislative Act of the Council of India in 1835. In this period, English under British administration obtained prominent status as the official language and was applied as a mean of instruction for the elite (Kachru, 1985, 2005). Now, English has lost its position as the official language in Indian society and recently has served as a lingua franca (ELF) which is salient in terms of research efforts and status recognition (Kachru, 1995, p.305). The Indianization of English (Kachru, 1986; Bernaisch & Koch, 2016) goes beyond the linguistic levels and symbolizes Indian local culture, as mentioned by Kachru (1986),

*These processes of Indianization go beyond the surface linguistic levels, and involve the underlying cultural presuppositions and their linguistic realizations. India's multilingualism and ethnic pluralism have added further levels of complexity. In 'mixing' words, phrases, clauses and idioms from the Indian*

*languages into English, or in 'switching' from one language into another, one is not –just using a code, one is also expressing an identity, a linguistic 'belonging'. Such -mixing and switching take for granted, for example, the multilingual and multicultural competence of the interlocutors. In such interactions, naturally, the 'native' speaker becomes peripheral: Indian English thus has become a code of local culture and local cultural presuppositions.*

Interaction of social, cultural and linguistic features in the teaching of English will be different between teachers and contexts. This investigation brings to light the ways in which English teachers in Outer and Expanding circles identify with different varieties of English. It also ascertains teachers' pronunciation favorites and goals, which may be applied to reshape EFL teaching context. Given the potential for teachers' biasness in terms of accent preferences, attitudinal data may lead to programs for the development of strategic skills among all teachers who wish to help learners to succeed in communicating in English as a lingua franca.

## **Methodology**

### **Objectives**

The abstract nature of attitude as a psychological concept and the mismatch between external behaviour and internal attitude make the study of language attitude methodologically challenging. Therefore, investigating attitudes towards a language can be a difficult task as attitude is not directly observable but can only be inferred from observable responses. (Ahn, 2017). This study aimed at investigating the developing picture of EIL pronunciation and evaluative reactions of Outer and Expanding Circle teachers towards their own English in the globalized world. To explore this area of interest further, the following research questions are formulated:

- 1 What are the attitudes of Outer and Expanding Circle teachers towards the pronunciation of their English variants?
- 2 What are Outer and Expanding Circle teachers' beliefs about the significance of NS accents and their functions in pronunciation standards?

The research questions have been devised to determine English teachers' attitudes towards their own variety of English by using the three components of attitude as an analytical tool: cognitive, affective and behavioural components (Garrett, 2010). Traditionally, language attitudinal studies were conducted with an indirect approach via a matched guised technique or a verbal guise technique, often looking at the affective component of attitude in relation to stereotypical impressions (Agheyisi & Fishman, 1970). This study, however, largely adopts direct research data- gathering techniques, aiming to examine all three components of attitude.

### **Participants**

There were altogether 260 English teacher participants from Iran and India as members of Outer and Expanding Circles who were all self-selected by responding to an email invitation to participate in an experimental study. The authors were in close contact with all participants through linkedin website ([www.linkedin.com](http://www.linkedin.com)). All Outer and Expanding Circle teachers were teaching English in British Council centers in New Delhi and Mumbai. Expanding circle teacher also had TESOL certificate in teaching English and were teaching in three English centers in

Tehran. The email invitation was linked to a website ([www.esurveycrator.com](http://www.esurveycrator.com)) where details of the study including research goals, what participants were expected to do could be found. Table 1 provides the general profile of the participants.

Participants' general information	Indian Teachers	Iranian Teachers
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	61	55
Female	69	75
<b>Educational Background</b>		
BA degree	32	37
MA degree	77	69
PhD	21	24
<b>Age</b>		
21-30	45	32
31-40	37	53
41-50	25	30
50 +	23	15
<b>Teaching Experience</b>		
0-1	17	17
1-5	49	28
5-10	28	37
10+	36	48

**Table 1: General profile of participants**

## Data Collection, Instrument and Procedure

The data of this study were elicited using a 12-item questionnaire. The questionnaire was a modified version adopted from Tokumoto and Shibata (2011). The questionnaire contained close-ended questions. The items attempted to measure three components constructing teachers' attitudes (Garette et al., 2003, 2010), which included cognitive, affective and behavioral components. The teachers were asked to respond to the items of the questionnaire on a 6-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = moderately disagree; 4 = moderately agree; 5 = agree; 6 = strongly agree) as shown in the appendix. Then, they were requested to specify what they believed to be of more priority in speaking English, native-likeness or message conveyance. In order to measure the internal consistency of the questionnaire in this study, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was utilized. The Cronbach's alpha reliability indices for the questionnaire were .79 for the total sample, .81 for the Iranian and .82 for the Indian groups.

The main types of validity for questionnaire validation investigated in the current study were content validity and construct validity. Before the actual administration of the questionnaire, it was piloted with 44 English teachers to check its content and written expression. For the pilot phase 32 Iranian and 12 Indian teachers participated. Six researchers were also consulted about whether the items in the questionnaire were clear and the scales were appropriate. Based on the feedback obtained, several modifications were done. In order to establish the construct validity, factor analysis was utilized to statistically check the validity. The second criterion concerning the suitability of running factor analysis is related to the inter-correlations among the items in the questionnaire. Bartlett's test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure determine this criterion. The values of KMO for the total sample,



Iranian and Indian groups were .758, .777 and .780 respectively. All values were higher than the minimum acceptable index of .50 (Field 2013). The whole questionnaire was written in English for both groups and the survey was conducted between January and September 2016. The data were analyzed using parametric analyses of independent t-test and one-way ANOVA which assume homogeneity of the variances of the groups and normality of the data.

The teachers' consent to participate in the study was sought and secured. They were assured that all the data collected were for research purposes only, and their confidentiality would be respected during the study. All the interview data were recorded with the participants' permission.

## Results

### Cognitive Constituent of Attitudes toward the Participant's Own Variety

Out of the 12 items, items 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 12, which were categorized as cognitive aspect, aimed to display the participants' cognitive goals with regards to speaking English which were further divided into three subsections: accentedness (item 3), intelligibility (items 6 and 7) and acceptability (items 10, 11, and 12).

In order to clarify how the two groups of participants perceived their own accents in terms of NS vs. NNS dichotomy, their ratings for item 3 were analyzed. As Table 2 shows, it can be claimed that the Indian teachers recognized and believed in their non-nativeness of English pronunciation more than the participants of the other group (MD = .938,  $t(258) = 6.80$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $r = .391$  representing a moderate effect size). The total percentage of negative responses was more than 69 per cent among the Iranians, whereas it was about 48 per cent among the Indians.

Item		Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test	d.f.	p	Effect size
3. I have a non-native accent	IND (N=130)	3.87	1.09	6.80*	258	.000	.391
	IND (N=130)	2.93	1.12				

\* $P < .01$  Note: IR= Iranian, IND= Indian

**Table 2: Descriptive statistics, results of Independent t-test, and effect sizes for accented judgment: Item 3 (N = 260)**

Following the accentedness judgment, the participants' evaluations of the intelligibility and acceptability of their own English were examined. The definition of intelligibility in the current study follows Derwing & Munro (1997). They divide intelligibility into subjective and objective intelligibility. Objective intelligibility is defined as 'the extent to which a speaker's utterance is actually understood' (Munro, Derwing & Morton 2006, p. 112), while subjective intelligibility (also named *comprehensibility*) is understood as the 'listeners' estimation of difficulty in understanding the message' (Munro, Derwing & Morton 2006, p. 112). In order to determine a NNS's level of intelligibility a proficient listener might ask, Do I understand the content of what this speaker has to say? (Murphy, 2014, p. 261). In this sense, the phrase 'to understand my accentedness English' in items 6 and 7 aims to show how the participants evaluate the intelligibility and comprehensibility of their own English when they communicate with native and non-native speakers of English.

Based on the results displayed in Table 3, it can be claimed that the Indian teachers significantly had a more positive attitude towards the intelligibility of their accented English in

terms of the perceived intelligibility to NSs compared to the Iranian EFL teachers ( $MD = .485$ ,  $t(258) = 3.68$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $r = .226$  representing a weak to moderate effect size). It should also be mentioned that there were many Indian and Iranian teachers (more than 30 per cent) who believed that they wouldn't be understood very well when communicating in real-world encounters.

Compared with the results of item 6, the results of item 7 also show that the Indian participants felt that their English was more intelligible when speaking to NNSs of English compared with the Iranians. ( $MD = .831$ ,  $t(258) = 6.37$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $r = .369$  representing a moderate effect size). The total percentage of positive responses was 69.2 per cent among the Indians, whereas it was 43.4 per cent among the Iranians.

Item		Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test	d.f.	p	Effect size
6. NSs can easily understand my accentedness English.	IND (N=130)	4.27	1.04	3.68*	258	.000	.226
	IR (N=130)	3.78	1.07				
7. NNSs can easily understand my accentedness English.	IND (N=130)	4.12	1.03	6.37*	258	.000	.369
	IR (N=130)	3.29	1.06				

\* $P < .01$  Note: IR= Iranian, IND= Indian

**Table 3. Descriptive statistics, results of Independent t-test, and effect sizes for intelligibility of accented English by 'native speakers': Items 6 and 7 (N = 260)**

In order to discover the degree of acceptability of the participants' own English, three different contexts were considered in the present study: international communication, Pedagogical situation and personal cross-cultural communication.

As table 4 displays, in the context of international communication, it can be claimed that there was not any significant difference between the Indian and Iranian EFL teachers' attitude towards acceptance of their pronunciation in international communication ( $MD = .185$ ,  $t(258) = 1.59$ ,  $p = .112$ ,  $r = .102$  representing a weak effect size).

For item 11, both the Indian and Iranian participants had no significant difference ( $MD = .108$ ,  $t(258) = .853$ ,  $p = .395$ ,  $r = .054$  representing a weak effect size). Majority of the participants in both groups (about 75 per cent) believed that their English pronunciation would be acceptable for other English teachers in pedagogical settings.

Item		Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test	d.f.	p	Effect size
10. My pronunciation would be acceptable in international communication	IND (N=130)	4.24	.90	1.59	258	.112	.102
	IR (N=130)	4.05	.95				
11. My pronunciation would be acceptable for other English teachers.	IND (N=130)	4.28	1.05	.853	258	.395	.054
	IR (N=130)	4.39	.98				
12. My pronunciation would be acceptable in personal cross-cultural communication	IND (N=130)	4.26	1.03	.473	258	.637	.028
	IR (N=130)	4.20	1.05				

Note: IR= Iranian, IND= Indian

**Table 4. Descriptive statistics, results of Independent t-test, and effect sizes for acceptability judgment: Items 10, 11 and 12 (N= 260)**

Based on the results displayed in Table 4, it can be claimed that there was not any significant difference between the Indian and Iranian teachers' in the context of personal cross-cultural communication ( $MD = .062$ ,  $t(258) = .473$ ,  $p = .637$ ,  $r = .028$  representing a weak effect

size). 75 per cent of the Indian English teachers and about 66 per cent of the Iranian teachers indicated that they are not worried about speaking the local variety of English in international contexts while the rest of the teachers in both groups were concerned about the acceptability of their own English in personal cross-cultural communications and were in favor of informal or casual context while speaking English.

### Affect for the Participants' Own Variety of English

The affective component, dealing with our feels towards an object, has been the most important area of attention for attitudinal studies of language because this component could determine a person's attitude. Through items 1 and 4, participants were requested to judge whether they were affectively attached to their own English pronunciation.

As shown in Table 5, the Indian participants were significantly more confident in their own variety of English than the Iranian EFL teachers ( $MD = .400$ ,  $t(258) = 3.28$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $r = .196$  representing a weak effect size). For item 4, which asked the participants if they were happy with their own accent, the results revealed that the Indian teachers were significantly happier with their own accent than the Iranian EFL teachers ( $MD = .723$ ,  $t(258) = 6.11$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $r = .354$  representing a moderate effect size). The total percentage of positive responses was 79 per cent among the Indians, whereas it was 42.8 per cent in the Iranian group.

Item		Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test	d.f.	p	Effect size
1. I am confident in my English pronunciation.	IND (N=130)	4.05	1.03	3.28*	258	.001	.196
	IR (N=130)	3.65	.96				
4. I am happy with my accent.	IND (N=130)	4.13	.97	6.11*	258	.000	.354
	IR (N=130)	3.41	.93				

\* $P < .01$

**Table 5. Descriptive statistics, results of Independent t-test, and effect sizes for affective judgment: Items 1 and 4 (N = 260)**

### Behavioral Judgment of the Participants' Own Variants

Items 2, 5, 8 and 9 attempted to uncover the teachers' behavioral intentions or actions of their own varieties of English. Table 6 (for item 2) displays the Indian teachers' stronger belief in their own non-native accent than Iranian EFL teachers ( $MD = .833$ ,  $t(258) = 5.36$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $r = .384$  representing a moderate effect size). A total percentage of 69.4 per cent of the Indian teacher believed that they speak English with non-native accent, whereas just 29.6 per cent of the Iranian teachers agreed that they have non-native accent.

Item		Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test	d.f.	p	Effect size
2. I speak English with a native-like accent.	IND (N=130)	3.97	1.01	6.65*	258	.000	.384
	IR (N=130)	3.14	1.00				
5. I hesitate to show my accent.	IND (N=130)	2.69	1.17	4.38*	258	.000	.259
	IR (N=130)	2.13	.86				
8. I would like to keep my accent.	IND (N=130)	4.35	.98	2.37*	258	.018	.134
	IR (N=130)	4.06	.94				
9. I would like to sound like a 'native speaker' of English.	IND (N=130)	4.45	1.08	17.20*	258	.000	.737
	IR (N=130)	2.35	.87				

Note: IR= Iranian, IND= Indian

**Table 6. Descriptive statistics, results of Independent t-test, and effect sizes for behavioral judgment: Items 2,5,8 and 9 (N = 260)**

For item 5, which asked the participants if they hesitated to show their own accent, a significant difference among the groups was found. ( $MD = .562$ ,  $t(258) = 4.38$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $r = .259$  representing a weak to moderate effect size). The Indian teachers were more willing to keep their Indian accents in real-world encounters than the Iranian teachers.

For item 8, the Indian teachers revealed a higher motivation to keep their accent than the Iranian EFL teachers ( $MD = .285$ ,  $t(258) = 2.37$ ,  $p = .018$ ,  $r = .134$  representing a weak effect size).

As for item 9, the Iranian teachers demonstrated more desire to look like a 'native speaker' of English ( $MD = 2.10$ ,  $t(258) = 17.20$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $r = .737$  representing a large effect size). About 90 per cent of the Iranian teachers had the ambition to attain a NS model, whereas about 85 per cent of the Indian teachers did not show this ambition.

The Iranian and Indian participants were also asked about their view towards the best pronunciation accent for their learners in ELT context. 84.0 percent of the Indians referred to the British accent and 94.0 percent of the Iranian teachers based on American accent.

Finally, the results in table 7 indicated that the Iranian teachers were more willing to pursue native-like pronunciation in their classes compared with the Indian teachers. As shown in table 7, the Iranian participants were more in favor of native-likeness (having a native-like accent) rather than message conveyance (focusing more on content than accent), whereas the reverse tendency was seen among the Indians.

	IR (N=130)	IND (N=130)
Native-likeness	82.0%	28%
Message conveyance	18.0%	72%

**Table 7. Percentage of priority in speaking English for your students (N=260)**

The Indian group, unlike the Iranians, showed much less desire towards nativism. Most of them agreed that accent has nothing to do with producing meaning. For the Indian teachers, meaning, and not native-like accent, was of key importance.

## Discussion

The underlying assumption before carrying out this study was that teachers of both circles held negative attitudes towards non-native variants of English. This negative perspective toward non-native variants of English can be seen in previous studies whereby speakers felt embarrassed in speaking about their own varieties of English (Matsuda, 2000, 2003; Takeshita, 2010; Luo, 2016; Meilin & Xiaoqiong, 2015; Munro, Derwing & Morton, 2006; Young & Walsh, 2010). However, in this study some of the attitudinal changes regarding cognitive, affective and behavioral elements, similar to what Tokumoto and Shibata (2011) and Ahn (2014, 2017) identified, were noticeable among Indian and Iranian teachers.

Findings of this study uncover that the stance towards English in Iran is exonormative at this point in time. Tendency towards exonormativity, favoring native-speakerism, is opposed to endonormativity which would accept educated local forms of using English as the goal for learners to attempt. Over the last fifty years, Iranian English teachers and L2 learners of English have often been displeased with a foreign accent and have strived to emulate a 'native' accent (Davari & Aghagolzadeh, 2015; Richards & Sadeghi, 2015) particularly American accent. The idealized view of native model, especially American model, and the perceived lack of intelligibility of non-native variants among Iranian teachers can be closely associated with the negative attitudes of learners towards non-native varieties of English. Richards and Sadeghi (2015) reported that about 70 percent of Iranian students favoured American English, 20 percent favored British English and a small amount (about 10 percent) favoured a localized version of English as spoken by an educated Iranian.

Considering India, the results of the study show that although British English is favored more positively among Indian teachers as the best linguistic model, they still have a positive attitude towards their own local variety. Endonormative teaching targets, such as India, are more sensitive to local cultures and more realistic to achieve and of course they can develop and supports local sources. In supporting endonormativity, Kirkpatrick (2007) believes that indigenous teachers of English, even if they are second-language users themselves, are more appropriate and successful in that role because they are the students cultural and linguistic, often multilingual, backgrounds. Local teachers of English are also more familiar with expected learning difficulties and specific acquisition strategies of students in the learning process. Such a typical linguistic situation in India might increase the Indian teachers' awareness of the functional value of their own Indian-accented English, creating their lower adherence to Native American and British varieties of English and supporting the notion of 'international posture'. International posture refers to a tendency to see oneself as connected to the international community, have concerns for international affairs and possess a readiness to interact with people of this community (Kormos et al, 2011; Yashima, 2009). Consequently, English speakers can no longer identify a specific culture or 'native speaker' group with acquiring English (Crystal 2003, 2008; Graddol, 1999; Jenkins, 2009); rather English is a means for communicating with various people in different settings successfully rather than identifying with any particular community/group of people. Studies by some scholars (Bernaisch & Koch, 2016; Hohenthal, 2003) all showed that although BrE is the variety which is rated most positively among the respondents, it conveys with it a 'colonial baggage' and Indian speakers of English have a positive attitude towards their own local variety.

Regarding the issue of language and identity, teachers' identity in both circles is under the effect of the myth of the superiority of 'native-speakers'. English teachers in both circles

shape multiple identities based on pedagogical and social contexts which reveal the different social and linguistic groups they belong (Petric, 2009; Norton, 2000). In the face of the battle with the ideology of 'native-speakerism' and the myth of the superiority of the native speakers, English teachers develop an identity which is tied to native speaker in order to be accepted by the private centers and by the learners. As Petric (2009) mentions, teacher's identity is a by-product of, and shaped by, a host of personal, interpersonal, institutional and sociopolitical factors. It can be stated that teachers are in a schizophrenic situation (Medgyes, 1983), by means of which they find themselves hating what they are and loving what they can never be (Llurda, 2009). ELT materials also construct particular images of native speakers, mostly with highly positive characteristics. So, it would not be surprising to see English teachers attempting to assimilate those identities by imitating NS accent in ELT contexts.

Despite these barriers, non-native English teachers are well-positioned to teach English in a multicultural context. Llurda (2009) mentions that by actively engaging English teachers in discussions regarding the renationalization of the language (McKay, 2003), we can develop the idea that English is not limited to one single country and promote a new paradigm in ELT and have an effective presence in the model of language taught in English language classrooms around the world. Llurda (2009), further mentions, that the negative attitudes of non-native teachers towards non-native varieties of English in the previous studies (e.g. Llurda and Huguet (2003), Llurda (2008), and Sifakis and Sougari (2005), have roots in teachers' lack of confidence in teaching English. The recognition of the pluricentricity of English and the plurilingual nature of today's communication with multicultural users of English might also have an effect on the shaping of pronunciation practice in the ELT classrooms. Raising teachers' awareness and confidence towards varieties of English accent can be really helpful to encourage learners' confidence in their own varieties of English and in turn it can help them to believe that an inner-circle pronunciation variety is not necessarily the best pedagogic model to be followed.

Jenkins (2002) believes that the intuitions that are taken into account for pronunciation are those of native speakers and little consideration is given to the intelligibility for non-native speakers, in spite of the fact that non-native speakers outnumber native speakers by a significant margin. Jenkins (2000, p.207) also points out, 'a native-like accent is not necessary for intelligibility in ELF interaction'. Jenkins' (2000) Lingua Franca Core (LFC) might be considered as a functional feature to the training of pronunciation in the beginning. While sustaining all the most key traits of phonology, Jenkins' model notifies learners about those aspects which are less important for global intelligibility than is presently educated to non-native learners in native-like educational circumstances. This model helps educators and learners to know problematic areas and not blindly follow a particular pronunciation version.

### **Implications for English Education in Iran**

Although the rapid spread of English in the globalized world implies more orientation towards comprehensibility and mutual understanding rather than sticking to tacit norm-based concepts, this study shows that sticking to 'native speaker' norms are still dominant among Iranian teachers. Exonormativity, with its roots in English nationalism, seems to be no longer appropriate in today's multilingual and multicultural setting. This tacit assumption can be challenged by further education and raising awareness of teachers and policy-makers towards English in the globalized world. As Schneider (2010) argues the way to go is to pool and develop local sources, recruit well-trained teachers from local contexts and recognize indigenous

cultural background and multilingual sources. English in its indigenous form can be a transporter of the local identity and will no longer be considered as alien by the users of it in different cultures. This includes the development of a curriculum that takes into account the sociolinguistic reality of English across the globe, rather than settling for a skewed one in which only select groups of native speakers are represented. Traditional EFL approaches to English teaching, which favor NS norms, may not 'adequately prepare' L2 learners of English to effectively interact and communicate with speakers 'from other English-speaking contexts' (Matsuda & Friedrich, 2011, p. 332). The main goal of English teacher preparation programs in Iran should be graduates who can teach students to communicate successfully with all sorts of speakers no matter which World English they use. Iranian learners need to be encouraged by teachers to build their own realistic model for their pronunciation instead of looking for native-speaker models, as stated by Lee (2012),

*When English is learned by millions of bilingual speakers as an additional language for international communication, it is necessarily denationalized and acculturated to local specific needs. Hence it is unacceptable that NS-based norms should prevail and serve as the yardstick for measuring NNSs' phonological accuracy, lexico-grammatical correctness and discourse-pragmatic appropriacy.*

Within studies of globalization, 'glocalization' is a term which should be used to refer to the adjustment of a global product to meet local needs and norms, and make it more marketable in various parts of the globe (Robertson, 1995). It must also be emphasized that ELT courses should include a sociocultural component to lessons in order to help Iranian learners to share aspects of their culture with other English speakers. (Alptekin, 2002; McKay, 2000; 2003).

## Conclusion

This paper investigated the language attitudes of Outer and Expanding circle teachers towards their own English variants. It provides data from both an ESL contexts, India, and EFL context, Iran, which place increasing importance on English learning and teaching. The analysis of the study showed that historical and political backgrounds of the two countries might have influenced the construction of English teachers' identity and the educational policy of each country. In the EFL situation, teacher participants were more prejudiced against their own variety of English and indicated their preference for native American English pronunciation. On the other hand, Indian teachers who have been exposed to Indian English and native variety of English in their society highly valued their Indian English while they were in favor of British English.

Our data seem to show the need for further research not only into the changes in the attitudes of Outer and Expanding circle teachers towards the language but also into students' attitudes towards English variants as the present study only involved teacher participants. Additionally, it is necessary to further investigate attitudinal changes of other Outer and Expanding Circle users to their own English varieties.

## References

- Agheysi, R., & Fishman, J. A. (1970). Language attitude studies: A brief survey of methodological approaches. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 12 (5), 137–157.
- Ahn, H. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards Korean English in South Korea. *World Englishes*, 33(2), 195–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12081>
- Ahn, H. (2017). *Attitudes to world Englishes: Implications for teaching English in South Korea*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56 (1), 57–64. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.1.57>
- Anchimbe, E. A. (2009). Local or international standards: Indigenized varieties of English at the crossroads. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 271–286). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bayard, D., Weatherall, A., Gallois, C., & Pittam, J. (2001). Pax Americana? Accent attitudinal evaluations in New Zealand, Australia and America. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(1), 22–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00136>
- Bayyurt, Y., & Sifakis, N. C. (2015). Transforming into an ELF- aware teacher: Insights from a self- education program. In P. Vetteorel (Ed.), *New frontiers in teaching and learning English* (pp. 55–76). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bernaisch, T., & Koch, C. (2016). Attitudes towards Englishes in India. *World Englishes*, 35 (1), 118–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12174>
- Bishop, G. D. (1979). Perceived similarity in interracial attitudes and behaviors: The effects of belief and dialect style. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 9, 446–465. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1979.tb02718.x>
- Borjian, M. (2013) *English in post-revolutionary Iran, from indigenization to internationalization*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bradac, J., & Wisegarver, R. (1984). Ascribed status, lexical diversity, and accent: Determinants of perceived status, solidarity, and control of speech style. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 3, 239–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X8400300401>
- Brown, J., & McGannon, J. (2007). *What do I know about language learning?* Paper presented at the 23rd ALAA (Australian Linguistics Association of Australia) Congress, Griffith University, Australia.
- Cheyne, W. M., (1970). Stereotyped reactions to speakers with Scottish and English regional accents. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9 (1), 77–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1970.tb00642.x>
- Coupland, N., & Bishop, H. (2007). Ideologised values for British accents. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(1), 74–93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00311.x>
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999>
- Crystal, D. (2008). Two thousand million? Updates on the statistics of English. *English Today*, 24(1), 3–6. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078408000023>
- Dailey, R. M., Giles, H. & Jansma, L. (2005). Language attitudes in an Anglo-Hispanic context: the role of the linguistic landscape. *Language and Communication*, 25, 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2004.04.004>



- Davari, H., & Aghagolzadeh, F. (2015). To teach or not to teach? Still an open question for the Iranian education system. In C. Kennedy (Ed.), *English Language teaching in the Islamic Republic of Iran: Innovations, trends and challenges* (pp.13-22).UK: British Council.
- Delamere, T. (1996). The importance of IL errors with respect to stereotyping by native speakers in their judgements of SL learners' performance. *System*, 24 (3), 279–297.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(96\)00022-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(96)00022-X)
- Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (1997). Accent, intelligibility, and comprehensibility: Evidence from four L1s. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 1-16.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001010>
- Eagly, A. H. & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Eagly, A. H. & Chaiken, S. (1998). Attitude structure and function. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., Vol. 1, pp. 269-322). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Erkmen, B. (2010). *Non-native novice EFL teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nottingham, England.
- Field, A. P. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics: and sex and drugs and rock 'n' roll* (fourth edition). London: Sage publications.
- Friedrich, P. (2000). English in Brazil: Functions and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 19 (2), 215–223. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00170>
- Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511844713>
- Graddol, D. (1999). The decline of the native speaker. *AILA Review*, 13, 57–68.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Groom, C. (2012). Non-native attitudes towards teaching English as a lingua franca in Europe. *English Today*, 28, pp 50-57. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607841100068X>
- Hohenthal, A. (2003). English in India: Loyalty and attitudes. *Language in India* 3(5). Retrieved from <http://www.languageinindia.com/may2003/annika.html>
- Huang, I. (2016). 'Everybody learns English, and so do I': The dominance of English and its effects on individuals. *English Today*, 32 (1), 28-34.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078415000504>
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms, new goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2002). A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an international language. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 83–103.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.1.83>
- Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitudes and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 200–207. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01582.x>
- Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a lingua franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 66 (4), 486– 494 <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs040>
- Jenkins, J. (2015). *Global Englishes: A resource book for students* (3rd ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.

- Johnson, F. L., & Buttny, R. (1982). White listeners' responses to 'sounding black' and 'sounding white': The effects of message content on judgments about language. *Communication Monographs*, 49, 33–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758209376069>
- Kachru, B.B. (1985). The pragmatics of non-native Englishes. In L.E. Smith (ed.) *English for cross-cultural communication* (pp. 15–39). Wiltshire: Macmillan.
- Kachru, B.B. (1986). *The alchemy of English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: Englishes across cultures* (2nd ed., pp. 48–75). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, Y. (1995). World Englishes and linguistic research. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 24, 305–308.
- Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes. Beyond the canon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). (2006). *The handbook of world Englishes*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as an Asian lingua franca and the multilingual model of ELT. *Language Teaching*, 44(2), 212–224. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000145>
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2015). World Englishes and local cultures. In F. Sharifi an (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and culture* (pp. 460– 470). London: Routledge.
- Krishnaswamy, N., & Krishnaswamy, L. (2006). *The story of English in India*, New Delhi: Foundation Books. <https://doi.org/10.1017/UPO9788175968233>
- Kormos, J., Kiddle, T., & Csizér, K. (2011). Goals, attitudes and self-related beliefs in second language learning motivation: An interactive model of language learning motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(5), 495–516. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amr019>
- Ladegaard, H., & Sachdev, I. (2006). 'I like the Americans...but I certainly don't aim for an American accent': Language attitudes, vitality and foreign language learning in Denmark. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(2), 91–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630608668542>
- Lambert, W., Hodgson, R., Gardner, R., & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of abnormal and social psychology*, 60 (1), 44–51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0044430>
- Lee, H. (2012). World Englishes in a high school English Class: A case from Japan. In A. Matsuda (ed.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 154–168). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Llurda, E. (2008). The effects of stays abroad on self-perceptions of non-native EFL teachers. In S. Dogancay-Aktuna, & J. Hardman (Eds.), *Global English language teacher education* (pp. 99–111). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Llurda, E. (2009). Attitudes towards English as an international language: The pervasiveness of native models among L2 users and teachers. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 119–134). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Llurda, E., & Hugué, A. (2003). Self-awareness in NNS EFL primary and secondary school teachers. *Language Awareness*, 13, 220–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410308667078>

- Luhman, R. (1990). Appalachian English stereotypes: Language attitudes in Kentucky. *Language in Society*, 19, 331–348. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500014548>
- Luo, W. (2016). Teacher perceptions of teaching and learning English as a lingua franca in the expanding circle: A study of Taiwan. *English Today*, Available on CJO 2016. doi:10.1017/S0266078416000146
- McDonald, C., & McRae, S. (2010). A pre-trial collection and investigation of what perceptions and attitudes of Konglish exist among foreign and Korean English language teachers in terms of English education in Korea. *Asian EFL* 12(1). 134–164.
- Matsuda, A. (2000). *Japanese attitudes toward English: A case study of high school students*. Lafayette, IN: Purdue University.
- Matsuda, A. (2003). The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 483–496. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2003.00314.x>
- Matsuda, A., & Friedrich, P. (2011). English as an international language: A curriculum blueprint. *World Englishes*, 30 (3), 332–344. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01717.x>
- Matsuda, A. (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- McKay, S. (2000). Teaching English as an international language: Implications for cultural materials in the classroom. *TESOL Journal*, 9 (4), 7–11.
- McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. (2003). Toward an appropriate EIL (English as an International Language) pedagogy: Re-examining common assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13 (1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00035>
- McKay, S.L. (2012). Principles of teaching English as an international language. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 28–46). New York: Routledge.
- McKay, S.L. & Brown, J.D. (2016). *Teaching and assessing EIL in local contexts around the world*. New York: Routledge.
- McKenzie, R. (2008). The role of variety recognition in Japanese university students' attitudes towards English speech varieties. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 29 (2), 139–153. <https://doi.org/10.2167/jmmd565.0>
- Medgyes, P. (1983). The schizophrenic teacher. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 37(1), 2–6. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/37.1.2>
- Meilin, C., & Xiaoqiong, H. (2006). Towards the acceptability of China English at home and abroad. *English Today*, 22 (4), 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078406004081>
- Meilin, C., & Xiaoqiong, H. (2015). China English at home and in the world. *English Today*, 21 (3), 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078406004081>
- Milroy, J., (2007). The ideology of standard language, in C. Llamas, L. Mullany and P. Stockwell (eds.), *The Routledge companion to sociolinguistics*, (pp. 133–9). London: Routledge.
- Morrish, J., (1999). The accent that dare not speak its name. *The Independent on Sunday*, 21 March.
- Munro, M., Derwing, T., & Morton, S. (2006). The mutual intelligibility of L2 speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 11–131. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060049>

- Murphy, J. M. (2014). Intelligible, comprehensible, non-native models in ESL/EFL pronunciation teaching. *System*, 42, 258-269.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.007>
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Oppenheim, B., (1982). An exercise in attitude measurement. In G. Breakwell, H. Foot, & R. Gilmour (eds.), *Social psychology: A practical manual* (pp. 38–56). Basingstoke: Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-16794-4\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-16794-4_3)
- Petric, B. (2009). ‘I thought I was an Easterner; it turns out I am a Westerner!’: EIL migrant teacher identities. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 135-150). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Rindal, U. (2010). Constructing identity with L2: Pronunciation and attitudes among Norwegian learners of English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 14 (2), 240–61.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2010.00442.x>
- Richards, J., and Sadeghi, K. (2015). The idea of English in Iran: An example from Urmia, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*,  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1080714>
- Robertson, R. (1995). ‘Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity’. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash & R. Robertson (eds.), *Global modernities*, (pp. 25-44). London: Sage.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446250563.n2>
- Schneider, E. W. (2011). *English around the world*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as an international language*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Sharifian, F. (2009). *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Sharifian, F. (2010). Glocalization of English in world Englishes: An emerging variety among Persian speakers of English. In T. Omoniyi & M. Saxena (eds.), *Contending with globalisation in world Englishes*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Sifakis, N. C. (2009). Challenges in teaching ELF in the periphery: The Greek context.’ *ELT Journal*, 63(3), 230–237. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn057>
- Sifakis, N. C. (2014). ELF awareness as an opportunity for change: A transformative perspective for ESOL teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3, 317– 335.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2014-0019>
- Sifakis, N. C., & Sougari, A. M. (2005). ‘Pronunciation issues and EIL pedagogy in the periphery: A survey of Greek state school teachers’ beliefs.’ *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 467–88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588490>
- Stewart, M., & Ryan, E. B. (1982). Attitudes towards younger and older speakers: effects of varying speech rates. *Journal of language and social psychology*, 1, 91–109.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X8200100201>
- Suzuki, A. (2011). ‘Introducing diversity of English into ELT: Student teachers’ responses.’ *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 145–153. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq024>
- Takeshita, Y. (2010). East Asian Englishes. In A. Kirkpatrick (ed.), *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes*, 265–281. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and international English: A classroom view. *ELT Journal*, 56(3), 240-249. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.3.240>

- Tokumoto, M. & Shibata, M. (2011). Asian varieties of English: Attitudes towards pronunciation. *World Englishes*, 30(3), 392–408. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01710.x>
- Tollefson, J. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality*. New York: Longman.
- Tsui, A.B.M., & Bunton, D. (2000). The discourse and attitudes of English language teachers in Hong Kong. *World Englishes*, 19 (3), 287–303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00180>
- Tucker, G., & Lambert, W. (1969). White and negro listeners' reactions to various American-English dialects. *Social Forces* 47 (4), 463–468. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2574535>
- Zhang, Q. (2013). The attitudes of Hong Kong students towards Hong Kong English and Mandarin accented English. *English Today*, 29, 9-16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078413000096>
- Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the ideal L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. In Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (Eds.), *Motivation, language, identity and the L2 self* (pp. 144-171). Bristol: Multilingual Matters Print.
- Young, J., & Walsh, S. (2010). Which English? Whose English? An investigation of 'non-native' teachers' belief about target varieties. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 23(2), 123–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908311003797627>

## Appendix: Questionnaire Items

1. I am confident in my English pronunciation.
2. I speak English with a non-native accent.
3. I have a non-native accent.
4. I am happy with my accent.
5. I'm not willing to show my English accent.
6. Native speakers of English can easily understand my accented English.
7. Non-native speakers of English can easily understand my accented English.
8. I would like to keep my accent.
9. I would like to sound like a native speaker of English.
10. My pronunciation would be acceptable in international business.
11. My pronunciation would be acceptable for other teachers of English.
12. My pronunciation would be acceptable in personal cross-cultural communication.